



Perle

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,771	05/23/2001	Lonny Avital	2109.002USU	2356
7590	07/15/2004		EXAMINER	
Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq. Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P. 10th Floor One Landmark Square Stamford, CT 06901-2682				LAO, SUE X
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2126
DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/863,771	AVITAL, LONNY
	Examiner	Art Unit
	S. Lao	2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5, 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6 are presented for examination.
2. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 5 ends in ";" instead of ". ". Appropriate correction is required.
3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Glaser (U S Pat. 5,953,731).

As to claim 1, Glaser teaches a method for editing (integration utility) web pages (HTML pages) comprising the steps of:

retrieving the source code defining a web page (display code of HTML page / FORM2 in code editor window, which inherently includes a substep of retrieving);

identifying insertion points (drop location) in the source code (code displayed in the code editor window); and

displaying the insertion points in a graphical format (arrow, representing a drop location, within FORM2 displayed in the code editor window). See col. 6, lines 6-18; col. 6, line 59 – col. 7, line 34.

As to claim 2, Glaser teaches inserting a script into the source code by selecting a particular insertion point (identify drop location); incorporating the script (applet code associated with selected control) into the source code to produce an updated web page (insert into FORM2 displayed in code editor window, col. 6, lines 7-19); and displaying the updated web page (fig. 6D, vs 6C).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glaser as applied to claim 1 in view of Truong (U S Pat. 6,151,609).

As to claim 3, Truong teaches uploading an updated web page to an internet host (send edited text/file to server 15 for storage, col. 10, lines 46-58) and directing a user to the uploaded, updated web page (use updated file to perform operations, col. 17, lines 28-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include uploading and directing steps into Glaser. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because this would have reduced communication cost (Truong, col. 3, lines 2-9, 44-59).

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glaser as applied to claim 1 in view of Truong and Hanson et al (U S Pat. 5,956,736).

As to claim 4, Glaser as modified by Truong teaches a method for editing source code comprising the steps of:

retrieving the source code (display code of HTML page / FORM2 in code editor window, which inherently includes a substep of retrieving) [see discussion of claim 1];

analyzing the source code for insertion points (identify drop location) [see discussion of claim 2];

displaying the source code (display code of HTML page / FORM2 in code editor window) showing the insertion points (drop location represented by arrow within FORM2 displayed) [see discussion of claim 1];

selecting at least one of the insertion points (identify drop location) [see discussion of claim 2];

inserting additional modular source code at the insertion point to produce update source code (insert applet code associated with selected control into FORM2 displayed in code editor window, fig. 6D) [see discussion of claim 2];

displaying the updated source code showing the additional modular source code (fig. 6D, vs fig. 6C);

uploading the updated source code to a desired location (send edited text/file to server 15 for storage) [see discussion of claim 3]; and

directing a user to the desired location (use updated file to perform operations) [see discussion of claim 3].

Glaser as modified by Truong does not teach entering a location of the source code to be edited, source code displayed includes a graphical representation thereof, the updated source code displayed includes a graphical representation thereof.

Hanson teaches web page/document editing, including entering a location of the source code to be edited (address of Demo page entered in browser, fig. 3), graphical representation of source code displayed (page Demo.html displayed in HTML Page view, showing icon of header, fig. 6C), graphical representation of the updated source code displayed (page Demo.html displayed in HTML Page view, showing icon HTMLHorizRule after editing with Object Editor, fig. 6D). See col. 10, line 21 – col. 11, line 10; col. 12, lines 1-27.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to include entering step, graphical representation of source code graphical representation of updated source code into Glaser. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Glaser as modified and Hanson because this would have provided a uniform representation and treatment of different features of HTML pages (object-oriented HTML-based authoring and serving environment, col. 4, lines 15-24, 40-52).

8. Claims 5, 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2126

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sue Lao whose telephone number is (703) 305-9657. A voice mail service is also available at this number. The examiner's supervisor, SPE Meng-Ai An, can be reached on (703) 305 9678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, from 9AM to 5PM. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872 9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Sue Lao

July 11,2004

Sue Lao